

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RICHARD A. MINFORD,

Plaintiff,

v.

BERKS COUNTY (INC.)/COUNTY OF
BERKS (INC.), along with its OFFICES,
Employees, agencies and instrumentalities;
and VARIOUS UNKNOWN OR
UN-NAMED AGENTS AND
INSTRUMENTALITIES a/k/a JOHN/JANE
DOE(S),

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 14-mc-224

ORDER

AND NOW, this 29th day of September, 2014, for the reasons set forth in the accompanying memorandum opinion, it is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

1. The plaintiff *pro se*, Richard A. Minford, will **SHOW CAUSE** why the court should not dismiss this action for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction;
2. The plaintiff, if responding, must file a response with the court no later than **Monday, October 20, 2014**;
3. If the plaintiff fails to respond to this order to show cause, the court will interpret his failure as an indication that he is unopposed to dismissal of this action; and
4. The court will decide the order to show cause on **Tuesday, October 21, 2014**, or soon thereafter, without oral argument unless otherwise ordered by the court.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Edward G. Smith
EDWARD G. SMITH, J.